

REMARKS

Note regarding claims

None of the independent claims pending in the patent application have been amended. Therefore, if the next office action relies upon different prior art in rejecting any of these claims as compared to the present office action, it necessarily has to be non-final, and not final. (See MPEP sec. 706.07(a))

Claim objections

Claims 6-7 have been objected to because there is insufficient antecedent basis for “offset voltage.” Applicant has amended claims 6-7 to instead recite “fixed offset voltage,” for which there is sufficient antecedent basis.

Claim rejections under 35 USC 102

Claims 1-4, 7, 13-16, and 19 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Beck (6,755,495). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Independent claims 1 and 13 recite a variable number of firing resistors to be fired *simultaneously*. As such, a circuit adjusts the magnitude of the voltage or current of the driving signal, dependent on the variable number of firing resistors to be so fired *simultaneously*.

In Beck, “the address leads are controlled so that only one FET 52 is switched on at a given time so that only a single firing resistor 48 has electrical current passed through it to heat the ink in a corresponding selected vaporization chamber at the given time” (col. 5, ll. 43-48). Therefore, Beck only fires a *single* firing resistor at a given time, not a variable number of firing resistors *simultaneously*, as in the invention.

As such, Beck inherently cannot disclose adjusting the magnitude of the voltage or current of the driving signal dependent on the variable number of firing resistors to be fired simultaneously – since Beck never fires more than one firing resistor at a given time.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has confused the fact that Beck can group a variable number of firing resistors together to be fired using the same circuit, as described in column 5, lines 29-36. However, even though a variable number of firing resistors can be fired using the same circuit, the circuit in question only fires *one* firing resistor at any given time.

For these reasons, Beck does not anticipate the claimed invention.

Allowable subject matter

Dependent claims 5-6 and 17-18 have been indicated as containing allowable subject matter. However, for the reasons stated above, Applicant nevertheless believes that claims 1 and 13 are not anticipated by Beck, and therefore are allowable as well.

Respectfully Submitted,



Michael A. Dryja, Reg. No. 39,662
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

August 29, 2009
Date

Law Offices of Michael Dryja
1474 N Cooper Rd #105-248
Gilbert, AZ 85233

tel: 425-427-5094
fax: 425-563-2098